1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 EZEKIEL JOHNSON, T-43903, 14 Petitioner, No. C 10-4682 CRB (PR) 15 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE VS. 16 TIM VIRGA, Acting Warden, 17 Respondent. 18 19 Petitioner, a state prisoner incarcerated at California State Prison, 20 Sacramento, has filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 21 22 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging a conviction from Contra Costa County Superior 23 Court. BACKGROUND 24 Petitioner was convicted by a jury of first degree murder and of conspiracy 25 26 to commit assault with force likely to cause bodily injury. A gang enhancement 27 was found true as to each crime. Petitioner admitted a prior prison term 28 allegation and he was sentenced to a total of 36 years to life in state prison.

Petitioner unsuccessfully appealed his conviction to the California Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of California, which on August 12, 2009 denied review of a petition allegedly raising the same claims raised here

## **DISCUSSION**

## A. Standard of Review

This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." <u>Id.</u> § 2243.

## B. <u>Claims</u>

Petitioner seeks federal habeas corpus relief by raising several claims, including jury selection errors, insufficiency of the evidence, improper admission of evidence and instructional error. Liberally construed, the claims appear cognizable under § 2254 and merit an answer from respondent. See Zichko v. Idaho, 247 F.3d 1015, 1020 (9th Cir. 2001) (federal courts must construe pro se petitions for writs of habeas corpus liberally).

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

1. The clerk shall serve a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto on respondent and respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

/

2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within 60 days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within 30 days of his receipt of the answer.

- 3. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within 30 days of receipt of the motion, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within 15 days of receipt of any opposition.
- 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must also keep the court and all parties informed of any change of address.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>Feb. 14, 2011</u>

CHARLES R. BREYER United States District Judge

26

27